

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SENTHIL MOHAN MURUGAIYAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

KATE ANDERSON, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-05272-CRB](#)

**ORDER ADOPTING R&R AND
DENYING MOTIONS FOR
INJUNCTIONS**

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Westmore's Report and Recommendation (dkt. 11) and has considered the objections filed by Plaintiff Senthil Mohan Murugaiyan (dkt. 14). On de novo review, the Court finds the Report correct, well-reasoned, and thorough. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); Civ. L.R. 72-3. The Court therefore overrules Plaintiff's objections and ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation in full.

Because Plaintiff's Complaint (dkt. 1) fails to state a claim, it is DISMISSED without prejudice, except for Plaintiff's claims brought under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 2703, 1702, 1513, and 2261A, which are DISMISSED with prejudice. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motions for a preliminary injunction (dkt. 15) and for a permanent injunction (dkt. 18) are DENIED because Plaintiff has established neither a likelihood of success on the merits nor actual success on the merits.¹ See Amoco Production Co. v. Village of Gambell, AK, 480 U.S. 531, 546 n.12 (1987). Additionally, because Plaintiff has failed to allege a cognizable claim, Plaintiff's motion for emergency relief (dkt. 7) is also DENIED.

Because Plaintiff's case was transferred to this Court, Plaintiff's motion to expedite

¹ The Court finds that these motions are suitable for resolution without oral argument or further briefing, pursuant to Local Rule 7-1(b).

a transfer (dkt. 10) is DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 23, 2024



CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California